# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/783,660	02/14/2001	Peter M. Mansour	SPRODQ1100	9105

29585	7590	11/18/2004

GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH LLP
153 TOWNSEND
SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107

EXAMINER
ZHONG, CHAD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2152	

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	09/783,660	MANSOUR ET AL.	
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Chad Zhong	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _03 November 2004_.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-70_ is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-70_ is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
   a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications:

Amendment, filed on 11/03/2004. This action has been made final.

2.   Claims 1-70 are presented for examination. In amendment A, filed on 10/08/2004:

Claims 1, 19, 38, 45, 53, 59 are amended.

Claims 65-70 are new.

Remaining claims are originally as filed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United
> States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has
> fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371 (c) of this title before the invention thereof by
> the applicant for patent.

5.   Claims 1-11, 13-17, 19-28, 30-64, 65-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated

by Simonoff et al. (hereinafter Simonoff), US 6,327,608.

6.   As per claim 1, Simonoff teaches a data processing method comprising:

       generating, with a client device (universal client), a particular form of a client-resident intermediate

user interface (UI) for a server-based and client-side controlled application according to a UI format

determined by a UI server (server 100), including supplementing a skeletal UI stored in a first memory

location (the GUI script file, Col. 9, lines 35-50)with one or more icons, labels or menu items, or

combinations thereof, stored in a second memory location (Col. 9, lines 33-50; Col. 11, lines 60-67);

transmitting a number of source data items related to said server-based application from said UI

server to said client device (Col. 9, lines 33-50); and

populating at least one native UI control used by said UI with said number of source data

items (Col. 9, lines 33-50; Col. 14, lines 33-41; Col. 16, lines 40-49).

7.   As per claim 2, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 1, further comprising the step of

formatting characteristics of said intermediate UI based upon a number of device capabilities for said

client device (Col. 7, lines 35-41).

8.   As per claim 3, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said at least one native

UI control is associated with an operating system for said client device (Col. 11, lines 64-67).

9.   As per claim 4, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 1, further comprising the step of

executing, at said UI server, said server-based application to manipulate source data items for presentment

at said client device (Col. 9, lines 33-50).

10.   As per claim 5, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 1, further comprising the

steps of:

generating an action request in response to a manipulation of said UI by a user of said intermediate

client device (Col. 12, lines 1-13); and

updating said intermediate UI in response to said action request (Col. 12, lines 1-13).

11.   As per claim 6, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 1, further comprising the

steps of:

performing an offline action by said client device while said client device operates in a

disconnected from said UI server (Col. 10, lines 23-30);

subsequently establishing a session between said client device and a UI server (Col. 9, lines 32-50); and

thereafter transmitting, from said client device to said UI server, a command indicative of said offline action (Col. 9, lines 32-50; Col. 10, lines 34-48).

12.   As per claim 7, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 6, further comprising the step of executing said command by said server-based application (Col. 9, lines 32-50).

13.   As per claim 8, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 6, wherein:

said offline action modifies at least one of said source data items at said client device (Col. 10, lines 23-30); and

said method further comprises the step of updating a corresponding number of source data items maintained by said UI server to reflect the modification of said source data items (Col. 9, lines 33-50).

14.   As per claim 9, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 1, further comprising the step of maintaining a shadow cache at said UI server, said shadow cache including a list of source data items transmitted from said UI server to said client device (Col. 8, lines 11-19; Col. 9, lines 33-50).

15.   As per claim 10, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 1, further comprising the step of saving said number of source data items in a client cache resident at said client device (Col. 14, lines 44-56).

16.   As per claim 11, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 5, further comprising the step of removing client cache items to accommodate said number of source data items (Col. 13, lines 35-44; Col. 14, lines 44-56).

17.   As per claim 13, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

sending a client action command related to said server-based application from said UI server to said

client device; and

executing said client action command by said client device (Col. 9, lines 33-50).

18.   As per claim 14, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said number of

source data items received during said receiving step represent a portion of a larger amount of

related data available at a UI server (Col. 16, lines 40-49; Col. 14, lines 44-56; Col. 9, lines 33-

50; Col. 10, lines 23-30).

19.   As per claim 15, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 14, wherein:

said larger amount of related data comprises a list of items; and said number of source data items

represents a subset of said list of items (Col. 16, lines 40-49).

20.   As per claim 16, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 14, wherein:

said larger amount of related data comprises a document (Col. 9, lines 33-50); and

said number of source data items represents a portion of said document (Col. 9, lines 33-50;

Col. 16, lines 40-49).

21.   As per claim 17, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 14, wherein:

said larger amount of related data comprises an image; and

said number of source data items represents a portion of said image (Col. 16, lines 40-49).

22.   As per claim 19, Simonoff teaches a data processing method comprising:

defining a user interface (UI) form in response to a number of device capabilities for a client device

(Col. 9, lines 33-50);
storing said UI form locally at said client device (Col. 10, lines 23-30);

saving a number of source data items locally at said client device (Col. 10, lines 23-30), said number

of source data items being related to a server-based application executed by a UI server (Col. 9, lines 33-50; Col. 12, lines 1-13); and

populating said UI form with said number of source data items, and wherein said number of source data items comprises a smaller subset than a total number of source data items related to said server-based application, and wherein further subsets of said total number of source data items are downloadable based upon execution of one or more client-side controls (Col. 9, lines 33-50).

23.   As per claim 20, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 19, further comprising the step of transmitting said number of source data items from said UI server to said client device (Col. 9, lines 33-50).

24.   As per claim 21, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 19, wherein said defining step is performed by said UI server in response to a device identifier obtained from said client device (Col. 9, lines 8-25).

25.   As per claim 22, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 19, further comprising the step of executing, at said UI server, said server-based application to manipulate source data items for presentment at said client device (Col. 12, lines 1-13).

26.   As per claim 23, Claim 23 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 5 above.

27.   As per claims 24-28, Claims 24-28 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claims 6-8, and 10-11 respectively.

28.   As per claim 30, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 27, further comprising the steps of:

updating said UI form in response to a manipulation of a display control rendered by said client

device;

requesting an additional number of source data items from said UI server if said manipulation of said

display control triggers a data request command; and

replacing source data items saved in said client cache with said additional number of source data

items (Col. 12, lines 1-13).

29.   As per claim 31, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 27, further comprising the steps

of:

updating said UI form in response to a manipulation of a display control rendered by said client

device;

retrieving additional source data items from said client cache in response to said manipulation of said

display control; and

displaying said additional source data items in said UI form (Col. 12, lines 1-13, lines 23-39).

30.   As per claim 32, Claim 32 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 13 above.

31.   As per claim 33, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 19, wherein said defining step

defines said UI form based upon said server-based application (Col. 9, lines 33-50).

32.   As per claim 34, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 19, wherein said defining step

defines said UI form with at least one native UI control stored locally at said client device (Col. 10, lines

23-30; Col. 12, lines 23-39).

33.   As per claim 35, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 19, wherein:

said UI server has access to a total number of source data items associated with said UI form (Col. 9,

lines 33-50); and

said number of source data items saved during said saving step represents a portion of said total

number of source data items (this section of the claim 35 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to

claim 14 above).

34.   As per claim 36, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 35, further comprising the steps

of:

said UI server receiving a request for additional source data items (Col. 12, lines 1-13; Col. 9, lines

33-50); and

said UI server transmitting a subsequent portion of said total number of source data items to said

client device in response to said request (Col. 12, lines 1-13; Col. 9, lines 33-50).

35.   As per claim 37, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 36, wherein said UI server

receives said request from said client device in response to a manipulation of said UI form (Col. 12, lines

1-13).

36.   As per claim 38, Simonoff teaches a data processing method comprising:

executing, at a user interface (UI) server, a server-based application configured to manipulate source

data items for presentment at a client device;

displaying a particular UI form of a client-resident intermediate UI at said client device according to a

UI format determined by a UI server, including supplementing a skeletal UI stored in a first memory

location with one or more icons, labels or menu items, or combinations thereof, stored in a second

memory location, said UI form being capable of presenting data items to a user of said client device;

generating a client side controlled action request in response to a manipulation of said UI form by a

user of said client device; and

updating said UI form in response to said action request (Col. 9, lines 33-50).

37.   As per claim 39, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 38, further comprising the steps

of:

     sending said action request from said client device to said UI server; and

     processing said action request by said UI server (Col. 9, lines 33-50; Col. 12, lines 1-13).
38.   As per claim 40, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 38, further comprising the step of

transmitting a number of source data items related to said server-based application from said UI server to

said client device, said transmitting step being performed in response to said action request (Col. 9, lines

33-50).

39.   As per claim 41, Claim 41 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 14 above.

40.   As per claim 42, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 41, further comprising the steps

of:

     requesting, from said UI server, said number of source data items in response to an initial

manipulation of said UI form; and

subsequently requesting, from said UI server, an additional number of source data items in response to a

further manipulation of said UI form;

     wherein said additional number of source data items represent a second portion of said larger amount

of related data (Col. 9, lines 33-50; Col. 12, lines 1-40).

41.   As per claim 43, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 38, further comprising the steps

of:

     said UI server receiving information representing new, deleted, or modified data items; and

     said UI server transmitting, to said client device, push data representing said new, deleted, or

modified source data items (Col. 9, lines 33-50).

42.   As per claim 44, Simonoff teaches A method according to claim 43, further comprising the step

of said UI server sending, to said client device, a push notification corresponding to said push data (Col.

12, lines 1-45).

43.   As per claim 45, Simonoff teaches a data processing method comprising:

        generating a user interface (UI) form definition for a server-based application based upon a number of

device capabilities for a client device;

        instructing said client device to render a UI form corresponding to said UI form definition;

        rendering said UI form with at least one native UI control associated with an operating system for

said client device;

        transmitting a number of data items from a UI server to said client device, said number of data items

being related to said server-based application; and

        displaying said number of data items in said at least one native UI control, and wherein said

number of source data items comprises a smaller subset than a total number of source data items

related to said server-based application, and wherein further subsets of said total number of

source data items are downloadable based upon execution of one or more client-side controls (Col. 9,

lines 33-50; Col. 12, lines 1-40).

44.   As per claim 46, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 45, further comprising the step of

specifying a command script corresponding to a manipulation of a UI control contained in said UI form,

said command script being configured for execution by said client device (Col. 9, lines 33-50).

45.   As per claim 47, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 46, further comprising the step of

executing, by said client device, said command script in response to the manipulation of said UI control at

said client device (Col. 9, lines 33-50; Col. 12, lines 1-13).

46.   As per claim 48, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 45, further comprising the step of

saving said number of data items in a client cache resident at said client device (Col. 14, lines 44-56).

47.   As per claim 49, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 48, further comprising the step of

retrieving said number of data items from said client cache prior to said displaying step (Col. 14, lines 44-

56; Col. 12, lines 1-40).

48.   As per claim 50, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 45, further comprising the step of

requesting, from said UI server, said number of data items in response to a manipulation of said at least

one native UI control (Col. 12, lines 1-13).

49.   As per claim 51, Claim 51 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 14 above.

50.   As per claim 52, Claim 52 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 42 above.

51.   As per claim 53, Simonoff teaches a distributed user interface (UI) architecture comprising:

    a client device architecture comprising a UI module configured to generate a particular form of a

client-resident intermediate UI for a server-based and client-side controlled application according to a UI

form definition, by supplementing a skeletal UI stored in a first memory location with one or more icons,

labels or meu items, or combinations thereof, stored in a second memory location, and to populate at least

one native UI control used by said intermediate UI with source data items; and

    a UI server architecture comprising a server send module configured to transmit, to said client device

architecture, a number of source data items related to said server-based application;

    wherein said UI module (Col. 15, lines 17-27) populates said UI control with said number of source

data items (Col. 9, lines 33-50; Col. 12, lines 1-13).

52.   As per claim 54, Simonoff teaches a distributed UI architecture according to claim 53, wherein

said UI server architecture further comprises a UI formatting module that generates said UI form definition based upon a number of device capabilities for a client device that includes said client device architecture (Col. 9, lines 33-50).

53.   As per claim 55, Simonoff teaches a distributed UI architecture according to claim 53, wherein said client device architecture further comprises a client cache configured to store said number of source data items (Col. 14, lines 44-56).

54.   As per claim 56, Simonoff teaches A distributed UI architecture according to claim 55, wherein said UI server architecture further comprises a shadow cache configured to store data representing the contents of said client cache (Col. 8, lines 15-20).

55.   As per claim 57, Simonoff teaches a distributed UI architecture according to claim 55, wherein said client cache is further configured to store said UI form definition (Col. 12, lines 44-56).

56.   As per claim 58, Claim 58 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 14 above.

57.   As per claim 59, Simonoff teaches a distributed user interface (UI) system comprising:

        a client device having a client processing architecture and

        a client communication element configured to communicate with a compatible communication element; and

        a UI server having a server processing architecture and a server communication element configured to communicate with said client communication element;

        said client processing architecture being configured to:

                transmit a device identifier to said UI server;

                generate a UI form in accordance with a UI form definition; and

populate at least one native UI control with a number of source data items associated with a

server-based application;

said server processing architecture being configured to:

receive said device identifier from said client device;

identify said UI form definition in response to said device identifier; and

send said number of source data items to said client device for rendering with said UI form, and

wherein said number of source data items comprises a smaller subset than a total number of source

data items related to said server-based application, and wherein further subsets of said total number of

source data items are downloadable based upon execution of one or more client-side controls (Col.

9, lines 33-50, lines 8-25; Col. 12, lines 1-40;).

58.   As per claim 60, Simonoff teaches a system according to claim 59, wherein:

said client device includes a number of device capabilities related to UI characteristics; and

said server processing architecture is further configured to generate said UI form definition based

upon said number of device capabilities (Col. 9, lines 33-50; Col. 11, lines 60-67).

59.   As per claim 61, Simonoff teaches a system according to claim 59, wherein said client device

further comprises a client cache configured to store said number of source data items (Col. 14, lines 46-

56).

60.   As per claim 62, Simonoff teaches a system according to claim 59, wherein said client device

further comprises a client cache configured to store said UI form definition (Col. 14, lines 46-56; Col. 12,

lines 1-40; Col. 10, lines 23-30).

61.   As per claim 63, Claim 63 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 14 above.

62.   As per claim 64, Claim 64 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 42 above.

63.   As per claims 65-66, claims 65-66 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 19 and 1

above respectively.

64.   As per claims 67-68, claims 65-66 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 19 and 1

above respectively.

65.   As per claims 69-70, claims 65-66 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 19 and 1

above respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

66.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

67.   Claims 12, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simonoff et

al. (hereinafter Simonoff), US 6,078,322, in view of Dillingham, US 6,327,608.

68.   As per claim 12, Simonoff does not teach a method according to claim 11, wherein said

removing step selectively removes said client cache items according to a hierarchical preference

scheme.

69.   Dillingham teaches a method according to claim 11, wherein said removing step

selectively removes said client cache items according to a hierarchical preference scheme (Col. 4,

lines 25-37; Col. 3, lines 60-61; Col. 8, lines 13-21; Col. 7, lines 30-37).

70.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was

made to combine the teaching of Simonoff and Dillingham because they both dealing with server

sending client scripts for client side generation of user interface (UI). Furthermore, the teaching

of Dillingham to allow wherein said removing step selectively removes said client cache items

according to a hierarchical preference scheme would improve the latency and communication

costs for Simonoff's system by sorting out the stored cache items in a hierarchy fashion, thus

improving speed of update by making update of such a cache in accordance with the sorted list.

71.   As per claim 29, Claim 29 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 12 above.

72.   Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simonoff et al.

(hereinafter Simonoff), US 6,078,322, in view of 'Official Notice'.

73.   As per claim 18, Simonoff does not teach a method according to claim 14, wherein:

        said larger amount of related data comprises a body of text; and

        said number of source data items represents a portion of said body of text. However 'Official

Notice' is taken by the Examiner that a text file is notoriously well known as a type of file. It

would have been obvious to have used a text file for the purpose of the current invention, because

doing so would be less burdening for the individual units, through the usage of text file in place

of image or a document and the like, the user now have the option of manipulating a portion of

the text file thereby improving processing efficiency and speed on the client side, thus realizing a

thin client network.

Conclusion

74.   Applicant's remarks filed 11/03/2004 have been considered but are found not persuasive

in view at the new grounds at rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendment.

75.   In the remark, the Applicant argued in substance that Siminoff fails to disclose or suggest

limitations of claim 1, instead, Siminoff disclose a universal client device that is embedded as an

Applet tag in a web page that is downloaded from a server host to a client device. The universal

client of Siminoff is apparently entirely embedded within the webpage and entirely downloaded

to a single memory location at the client device.

76.   In response to Applicant's amendment, Simonoff teaches the above sections.

The GUI objects themselves are being pushed down from the server to client via GUIScript, thus

moving data objects from first memory to second memory is realized. Thus Simonoff teaches the

sections stated in claim 1.

77.   In the remark, the Applicant argued in substance that Siminoff does not teach the

downloading a subset of the total list of data items from the server.

78.   In response to Applicant's amendment, Simonoff teaches this section.

Referring to Col. 11, lines 60 – Col. 12, lines 13 for instance, user events is causing downloading

of additional data items which is inherently a subset of the total data item list available on the

server. Simonoff explicitly teaches user events causing download of additional data items from

the server. The data items on server in totality is the super set and the subset of data items used

for UI generation embedded within the GUIscript is merely a subset of the total data items

available on the server. Thus, Simonoff teaches the above section.

79.   Applicant's remarks filed 11/25/03 have been considered but are not persuasive.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reined of the extension of time policy as set

forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

        A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR

1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however

will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this

final action.

80.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents and publications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to

"PLATFORM-INDEPENDENT DISTRIBUTED USER INTERFACE CLIENT ARCHITECTURE".

i.	US 5818447	Wolf et al.
ii.	US 2002/0152244	Dean et al.
iii.	US 6167534	Straathof et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to Chad Zhong whose telephone number is (703) 305-0718. The examiner can normally be

reached on M-F 7am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John

A Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this

application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238

for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should

be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Dung C. Dinh
Primary Examiner